

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-57 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND Claims 20, 22, 38, and 41.

Applicants' counsel greatly appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the Personal Interview of March 27, 2006. Applicants' counsel and the Examiner discussed the prior art rejections of Claims 20 and 41 relying upon Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al. With respect to Claim 20, the Examiner indicated that Yagi et al., applied alone, does not teach or suggest each feature recited in Claim 20. However, the Examiner indicated that she believed that the combination of Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al. might teach each feature recited in Claim 20. With respect to Claim 41, the Examiner indicated that she believed that the combination of Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al. might still teach each feature recited in Claim 41. As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al. fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in Claims 20 and 41.

The Examiner rejected Claims 22, 38, and 41-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner alleged that Claims 22, 28, and 41 contain minor informalities. Applicants amended Claims 22, 28, and 41 to correct these informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 22, 38, and 41-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected Claims 20, 21, 24, 25, 36, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yagi et al. (U.S. 6,019,616). The Examiner rejected Claims 22, 23, 26-35, 37, and 40-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yagi et al. in view of Korsunsky et al. (U.S. 6,039,583). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 20-57.

Applicants have amended Claim 20 to recite:

An electrical connector, comprising:
a plurality of contacts;
a first electrically conducting plate; and
a second electrically conducting plate positioned opposite to and
oriented substantially in parallel with the first electrically conducting plate;

wherein

the first and the second electrically conducting plates each include a plurality of fingers disposed therein;

each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to only one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates; and

each finger of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates corresponds to only one of the plurality of contacts of the electrical connector. (emphasis added)

In the second full paragraph on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Yagi et al. teaches each feature recited in Applicants' Claim 21.

Applicants amended Claim 20 to recite the features of "each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to only one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates" and "each finger of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates corresponds to only one of the plurality of contacts of the electrical connector." That is, Applicants' Claim 20 requires a one-to-one correspondence between the contacts of the electrical connector and the fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates.

As seen in **Figs. 4 and 7** of Yagi et al., Yagi et al. teaches that the fingers **9** are spaced apart along the grounding shield **4** such that the number of contacts **3** is much larger than the number of fingers **9**. That is, Yagi et al. fails to teach or suggest a one-to-one correspondence between the contacts **3** of the electrical connector and the fingers **9** of the first and the second electrically conducting plates as required by Applicants' Claim 20.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Yagi et al. fails to teach or suggest the features of "each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to only one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates" and "each finger of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates corresponds to only one of the plurality of contacts of the electrical connector" as recited in Applicants' Claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yagi et al.

Applicants have amended Claim 41 to recite:

An electrical connector, comprising:
a plurality of electrically conducting members arranged along a row;
at least one electrically conducting plate disposed substantially parallel to the row of electrically conducting members; and
a plurality of connection portions, **each of the plurality of connection portions corresponds to only one of the plurality of electrically conducting members** and **each of the electrically conducting members arranged along the row corresponds to only one of the plurality of connection portions**; wherein
for each conducting member arranged along the row, the corresponding electrically conducting member and connection portion and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that each conducting member can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate or can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate;
the conducting members that are selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate belong to a first group of the plurality of conducting members; and
the conducting members that are not selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate belong to a second group of the plurality of conducting members. (emphasis added)

In the third full paragraph on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the combination of Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al. teach each feature recited in Applicants' Claim 41. The Examiner admitted that Yagi et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the conducting members being selectable to be or not to be connected to the conducting plate." The Examiner has relied upon Korsunsky et al. to allegedly teach this feature.

Applicants amended Claim 41 to recite the features of "each of the plurality of connection portions corresponds to only one of the plurality of electrically conducting members" and "each of the electrically conducting members arranged along the row corresponds to only one of the plurality of connection portions," which are similar to the features discussed above with respect to Claim 20. That is, Applicants' Claim 41 requires a one-to-one correspondence between the electrically conducting members arranged along the row and the connection portions.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Yagi et al. and Korsunsky

et al. fails to teach or suggest these features.

With respect to Yagi et al., as discussed above, Yagi et al. fails to teach or suggest a one-to-one correspondence between the contacts **3** and the fingers **9**. That is, Yagi et al. fails to teach or suggest a one-to-one correspondence between any electrically conducting members arranged along the row and any connection portions as required by Applicants' Claim 41.

With respect to Korsunsky et al., as shown in **Figs. 3, 5, and 6** and as discussed in the first three paragraphs of column 5 of Korsunsky et al., the contacts **92, 94** and **92', 94'** and **92'', 94''** (which the Examiner has alleged corresponds to the connecting portions recited in Applicants' Claim 41) are arranged on different ground planes to ground particular contacts **50** (which the Examiner has alleged corresponds to the electrically conducting members recited in Applicants' Claim 41) with the specific signal contacts to ground contacts ratios of 4:1; 1:1; and 7:1, respectively. For example for the signal contacts to ground contacts ratio of 1:1 in which the contacts **50** have the arrangement GSGSGSGS or the arrangement SGSGSGSG for each set of eight contacts **50**, a pair of contacts **92', 94'** are provided on the ground shield such that they ground every other contact **50**. That is, Korsunsky et al. teaches one pair of contacts **92', 94'** are provided on the ground shield for every two contacts **50**, where each pair of contacts **92', 94'** are provided on the ground shield corresponds to only one of the two contacts **50**, and fails to teach or suggest a one-to-one correspondence between the pairs of contacts **92', 94'** are provided on the ground shield and the contacts **50**.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Korsunsky et al. fails to provide any motivation to modify Yagi et al. to include a one-to-one correspondence between the contacts **3** of Yagi et al. and the fingers **9** of Yagi et al. At best, Korsunsky et al. provides motivation, if one of ordinary skill in the art wanted to change the ratio of ground contacts to signal contacts in the device of Yagi et al., to modify the number of fingers **9** of Yagi et al. to provide the fingers **9** of Yagi et al. at only those contacts **3** of Yagi et al. that one of ordinary skill in the art wanted to ground.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of "each of the plurality of

connection portions corresponds to only one of the plurality of electrically conducting members” and “each of the electrically conducting members arranged along the row corresponds to only one of the plurality of connection portions” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 41.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yagi et al. in view of Korsunsky et al.

In anticipation of the Examiner rejecting Claim 20 based upon the combination of Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al., Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al. fails to teach or suggest the features of “each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to only one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates” and “each finger of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates corresponds to only one of the plurality of contacts” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 20 for reasons similar to the reasons discussed above with respect to why the combination of Yagi et al. and Korsunsky et al. fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in Applicants’ Claim 41.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claim 20 and 41 of the present application. Claims 21-40 and 42-57 depend upon Claims 20 and 41 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 20 and 41 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Serial No. 10/822,341
March 29, 2006
Reply to the Office Action dated December 29, 2005
Page 14 of 14

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 29, 2006

/Peter Medley #56,125/
Attorneys for Applicants

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Peter Medley
Registration No. 56,125